

COLONIAL AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

239

December 1686. Personally Andros was not a bad governor despite the evil reputation which he

in American history ; he was not brutal, or oppressive, or unjust.¹ But the policy he was instructed to carry out was arbitrary and unconstitutional. The main grievance of the New Englanders against the government he directed was set forth in the protest with which the General Court of Massachusetts accompanied its submission. * The subjects *, they complained, * are abridged of their liberty as Englishmen both in the matters of legislation and the laying of taxes ' ; and though Andros gave New England a better administration than either Maryland or Virginia possessed, it could not reconcile the colonists to the loss of their liberties. In April 1689, when the news of the revolution in England reached America, the inhabitants of Boston rose against the government, imprisoned Andros, seized the forts which dominated the town, and captured a frigate which lay in the harbour. ' We have been quiet, hitherto/ they declared, * but now [that] the Lord has prospered the undertaking of the Prince of Orange^ we think we should follow such an example. We, therefore, seize the vile persons who oppressed us/a There were similar revolutions in Connecticut and Rhode Island, and more violent ones in Maryland

and New York. Before the close of 1689 William and Mary were accepted and proclaimed as the American colonies.

The policy of James in the colonies was the counterpart of his policy at home, in so far as it was an attempt to substitute personal government for self-government. But in so far as it was an attempt to strengthen the control of the mother country over the colonies it was a national rather

¹ See C. M. Andrews, *Colonial Self-Government* (1904).

³ *Ibid.* p. 277.